

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Applicant No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/001,412	HERBERT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	VINH P NGUYEN	2829	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Applicant:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) VINH P NGUYEN.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Mr. Pienkos.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 27 May 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

42-43,48

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner discussed with Mr. Pienkos about making some changes in claim 43 for improving the clarity (see Examiner's amendment). Examiner also questioned Mr. Pienko about the terms "expansion element" and "intermediate arms". According to Mr. Pienko, these terms are referred to element "54" shown in the drawings. .